Vertically Integrated Analysis and Transformation for Embedded Software

John Regehr University of Utah

Embedded Systems

- Most new microprocessors are embedded
 - > Consumer electronics
 - > Vehicle control systems
 - > Medical equipment
 - Smart dust











Problem

- Compared to general-purpose compilation:
 - > We have a lot more information
 - > We have a lot more constraints
- So, using standard toolchain:
 > Ignores most of the information
 > Ignores most of the constraints
- However:
 - Strong economic incentive to avoid reinventing the wheel

Vertically Integrated Program Analysis (VIPA)

 Framework for combining analyses and transformations operating on a system at multiple levels of abstraction

(1) What good is gcc?

- Traditional C/C++ compilers pretty close to end of the line with respect to optimizing embedded SW
- However, C/C++ still useful for a while
- ♦ VIPA:
 - Keep the compiler around as a code generator
 - But do analysis and coarse-grain transformation in separate tools

(2) Tradeoffs are hard

- Embedded compilers must make difficult tradeoffs between goals
 - > Power use, code size, data size, avoid crashing, etc...
 - Each embedded system has a different prioritization for these goals
- Standard compilers are illequipped to do what we want
 - > Mechanism and policy all mixed up

(3) Levels of abstraction

- Analyses and transformations need to be performed at multiple levels of abstraction
 - > Model task mapping, exclusive modes, real-time deadlines
 - Source concurrency, exceptions
 - > Binary memory usage, execution time, bit widths
- Standard compilers are illequipped to do what we want

(4) Tools are myopic

- Analysis tools often return binary results
 - System is not schedulable"
 - Substitution of the second state of the sec
- Often more information is available but hidden
 - > Which task is blocking schedulability?
 - > What is the path to max stack depth?
- This information can be exploited

(5) Analysis good!

- Increasing asymmetry between
 - > Resources on a PC and
 - > Resources on a typical embedded system
- Program analysis and transformation tools are rapidly becoming more useful and effective
- The asymmetry can and should be exploited

VIPA Example 1

• Given:

- > Tool to compute a static upper bound on stack memory usage
- > Global function inlining tool
- ♦ Goal:
 - > Reduce the stack memory requirements of an embedded system

Reducing Stack Depth [EMSOFT 2003]

- Observation: Function inlining often decreases stack requirements
 - > Avoids pushing registers, frame pointer, return address
 - Called code can be specialized
- Strategy: Use stack tool output as input to global inlining tool

Feedback Loop



Challenges

- 1. Inlining causes code bloat
 - Solution: Minimize user-defined cost function that balances stack memory and code size
- 2. Inlining sometimes increases stack depth!
 - Solution: Trial compilations
- 3. Search space is exponential in number of static function calls
 - Solution: Heuristic search

Results

- Averaged over a bunch of TinyOS kernels...
 - > 60% reduction in stack requirements compared to no inlining
 - > 32% reduction compared to wholeprogram inlining not aimed at reducing stack depth

Result Details



VIPA Example 2

- Given:
 - > WCET analysis
 - > Synchronization analysis
 - > Race / deadlock detection
 - > Synchronization transformation
 - > Lock elimination
 - > Lock coarsening
 - > Real-time-aware task mapping
- Goal: balance response time, efficiency, and memory use



VIPA Example N

Given:

Many, many tools that exist for analyzing and transforming embedded software



Rapidly produce efficient and reliable software

What is VIPA?

- Exchange formats for analysis results
 - > Annotated callgraph
 - > Annotated task set
 - > Others?
 - > Type and alias information
 - > Heap allocation / deallocation protocols
- Tools "opened up" to read/write the exchange formats

What is VIPA? Cont'd

- Strategies for connecting tools
 - > E.g. feedback loops
- Policies
 - > Manage tradeoffs between goals
- Auxiliary tools (that don't exist yet)
 - > GUI to help developers specify tradeoffs
 - Manage interactions between analyses

Research Challenges

- Maintaining invariants
 - > Transformations will invalidate some analysis results
- Avoiding bloat in the trusted computing base
 - Embedded developers have a hard time trusting even the compiler
- Avoiding long build times
- Providing good error messages

Related Work

- Phasing of optimizations inside compilers
- Model based design of embedded software
- MOBIES analysis interchange format

Conclusion

Benefits for developers:

- Keep using the standard toolchain
- > Write straightforward code
 - > Fewer fragile manual specializations
- Explicit support for meeting design goals in the presence of tradeoffs

> Policies externalized

- Benefit for researchers:
 - > Lots of cool tools out there let's make them play together

More info here: http://www.cs.utah.edu/~regehr/